```
Page 1
 1
                          UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                         WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 3
                                   AT SEATTLE
 5
                                     )
 6
 7
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et )
 8
                       al.,
                                    ) Case No.: C70-9213
                                     )Subproceeding No. 01-1 (Culverts)
 9
10
                       Plaintiffs,
11
         vs.
12
     STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al., )
13
                        Defendants. )
14
15
16
                      DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION OF
17
                                  RUSS LADLEY
18
19
                                April 25, 2006
20
                                    9:30 a.m.
                               801 Second Avenue
21
                              Seattle, Washington
22
23
24
                          Carl T. Beck, Court Reporter
25
                                    CCR 2952
```

Page 27

- 1 A Not yet.
- 3 testifying in the case is selected culverts in the case area
- 4 whose repair or replacement could positively affect
- 5 anadromous fish populations. So I'd like to focus in on
- 6 that area right now.
- 7 A Okay.
- 8 Q Are there specific portions of the case area that you expect
- 9 your testimony to cover?
- 10 A I've told the attorneys that my expertise is primarily WRIA
- 10, and that's where my strongest, you know, background and
- 12 understanding of blockage issues exists.
- 13 Q But apparently there's still a question about whether you're
- 14 going to testify to --
- 15 A I don't think it's their question. I think I'm assigned a
- 16 region from the Cedar south -- or excuse me -- yeah, the
- 17 Cedar south through Nisqually; so Cedar, Green, White,
- 18 Puyallup, and Nisqually.
- 19 Q And are you presently familiar with culvert conditions in
- the Cedar and Green and Nisqually Rivers?
- 21 A I am not. I have a very vague understanding of those
- 22 drainage courses.
- 23 Q And so you -- I guess you plan to study those areas
- 24 before --
- 25 A That's correct.

Page 28 Q -- the case? I had some questions with respect to WRIA 15, 1 which is from the Key Peninsula, Giq Harbor, and Islands 2 watershed. Is that an area that you're familiar with? A The Tribe does exercise some U&A over to the Gig Harbor Unfortunately, I have a very limited familiarity with 5 it. Q Are there any other areas where you expect to testify about 7 culverts in any other river or stream systems in the case 8 area? A Outside of those just mentioned, no. 10 11 Q I'd like to talk a little bit about the Pierce County Conservation District inventories that you participated in. 12 13 My understanding is that you participated in the completion of two watershed fish passage inventory projects 14 15 with the Pierce County Conservation District. A [The witness nods]. 16 Q Is that a "Yes"? 17 A That's correct. Yeah, we contributed funding to it. 18 19 Actually, wrote a grant trying to get it through the Bureau of Indian Affairs; was not successful there, and passed that 20 grant on to the Conservation District which submitted it, I 21 believe, to the IACS, who funded that study ultimately. I 22

Q One of these reports concern the Puyallup River watershed or WRIA 10, right?

believe that's correct.

23

24

25

Page 46

- 1 A They own the property.
- 2 Q And the County has an easement?
- 3 A Correct. That's my understanding.
- Q For the 96th Street Wetland, that's Project No. 8, do you
- 5 know who owns the road and the culvert that's blocking for
- 6 that particular project?
- 7 A Yeah. In this case, it's not actually a road. It's just a
- 8 levee, and it's a County levee.
- 9 Q The introductory pages -- or the introduction on page one
- seems to focus on a problem of channelization on the
- 11 Puyallup River.
- 12 My understanding is that channelization would restrict
- 13 the flow of a river into a main channel and then eliminate
- its ability to spread out into side channels. Is that a
- 15 fair --
- 16 A That is fair to say.
- 17 Q The report seems to indicate that there are over 45 miles of
- levees on the Puyallup, White, and Carbon Rivers. Has that
- 19 number changed since this catalog was prepared in 1999?
- 20 A It has not. I would emphasize the fact that the 45 miles
- could be construed as 90 miles, though, because it's levees
- on both sides of the river.
- Q Okay.
- 24 A If that makes sense.
- 25 Q Uh-huh. Yes.

Page 59

- 1 A I believe it was Travis Nelson and possibly Don Nauer.
- 2 Q Do you happen to know how to spell Mr. Nauer's last name?
- 3 A N-a-u-e-r.
- 4 Q What was your conversation with WDFW like?
- 5 A We were trying to express our concern at the likelihood of
- 6 continued losses of juvenile fish during high-flow periods.
- 7 Q And what kind of response did you get from Mr. Nelson and
- 8 Mr. Nauer?
- 9 A They had a -- they shared the concern.
- 10 Q Did they commit to do anything about it?
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q Do you know whether the South Prairie Creek at State Route
- 13 162 is on WDFW's Fish-passage Blockage Database?
- 14 A I do not know.
- 15 Q So you don't know whether it has a Priority Index?
- 16 A I do not.
- 17 Q Okay. Now that we've talked about a few specific culverts,
- does that help jog your memory as to any other particular
- 19 State-owned barrier culverts that stand out in your mind?
- 20 A There's a couple I know of under Highway 410 between
- 21 Enumclaw and Greenwater, but it's been so long since I've
- 22 seen them, I honestly don't know their status.
- 23 Q Any others?
- 24 A There is another State-owned culvert on the east fork of
- 25 Hylebos Creek.

Page 60 Q And do you know under what road that would be? 1 A It's Enchanted Parkway. I forget which number that is. 2 Q For the east fork of Hylebos Creek, is that a barrier to 3 fish passage? A It was. I'm told by DOT staff that it was repaired 5 recently. Personally, I have not seen it since the repair. 6 Q Do you know how it was repaired. A I do not. 8 [Exhibit No. 7 marked for identification.] 9 MR. FERESTER: I have just a few more questions 10 and then we can probably take a lunch break. 11 [By Mr. Ferester] I've handed you what's been marked 12 Exhibit 7, and I'll represent that this is, in particular, 13 the Puyallup Tribe's response to the State of Washington's 14 15 Interrogatories No. 81 and 82. And, actually, I'm 16 particularly interested in the Puyallup's response to 17 Interrogatory 82; but because that referred to the answer to 18 81, I've provided both. 19 First of all, do I understand correctly that you helped 20 the Puyallup Tribe answer the State's Interrogatories in 21 this case? 22 A That's correct. 23 Q Did you help prepare this answer to the State's third set of 24 Interrogatories, which would have been last spring? 25 A Which Interrogatory are you referring to?

Page 95 1 CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON) 3 SS COUNTY OF KING 5 I, Carl T. Beck, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington hereby certify: That the foregoing deposition was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth; 8 9 That the witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; 10 and that the testimony of the witness and all objections 11 12 made at the time of the examination were recorded by voice 13 recognition by me, and thereafter transcribed under my 14 direction; 15 That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witness and of all objections made 16 at the time of the examination, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am in no way related to any 17 party to this matter nor to any of counsel, nor do I have any interest in the matter. 18 Witness my hand and seal this the 8th day of May, 2006. 19 20 CARL T. BECK, Notary 21 Public in and for the State Of Washington, residing at 22 23 King. Commission expires 24 June 26, 2007 25